



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,375	06/06/2001	John G.K. Williams	20031000820	8990

20350 7590 03/05/2003

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

STRZELECKA, TERESA E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1637

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/876,375

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMS ET AL.

Examiner

Teresa E Strzelecka

Art Unit

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 06 February 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to an After Final amendment filed on February 6, 2003.

Amendment has been entered.

2. Applicants cancelled claims 29-54. Claims 1-14 and 16-28 are pending.

3. Applicants argue that the provisional obviousness double-patenting rejection of claims 1-14 and 16-28 over claims 22-26 of the co-pending application No. 09/876,374 should be withdrawn according to MPEP 804. However, this Office action is made non-final because of new grounds for rejection, therefore the provisional double-patenting rejection is maintained.

Drawings

4. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on February 6, 2003 have been approved. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 18-23 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Prudent et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,090,543).

Before proceeding with the rejection, Applicants' definition of a charge-switch NP probe is provided:

“The term “charge-switch nucleotide” as used herein refers to a labeled nucleotide phosphate (e.g., γ -NP-Dye) that upon release or cleavage of a phosphate detectable moiety (e.g., PPi-Dye) has a different net charge associated with the cleavage product compared to the intact nucleotide phosphate probe (e.g., γ -NP-Dye).” (page 7, lines 28-31).

“The phrase “phosphate detectable moiety” refers to a detectable cleavage product from a NP probe of the present invention. Examples include, but are not limited to, PPi-Dye, PP-F, P-Dye, a phosphate fluorophore moiety, a terminal phosphate fluorophore moiety, a detectable moiety, charged groups, electrically active groups, detectable groups, reporter groups, combinations thereof, and the like.” (page 8, lines 6-10).

Regarding claims 18-21, 23 and 28, Prudent et al. teach dinucleotides comprising intact nucleotide triphosphate charge-switch probes (a second, 3' nucleotide), which have positively charged $R-NH_3^+$ groups attached to the C5 position of a base through C_{10} or C_6 linkers. The NH_3^+ group results in a net -1 negative charge for the NP probes. In addition, positively charged dyes (such as Cy-3) are attached to phosphates of the first (5') nucleotides. (col. 112, lines 12-41; Figures 56, 57).

Dephosphorylation of these oligonucleotides and of the NP probes results in reversal of the charge of the NP probe, which acquires a net charge of $+1$. Therefore, after dephosphorylation, the NP probe moves towards the negative electrode, whereas the phosphate moiety moves towards the positive electrode (col. 112, lines 42-49; col. 113, lines 20-36; Fig. 59).

Regarding claim 22, Prudent et al. teach dephosphorylation using Calf Intestinal Alkaline Phosphatase (CIAP) (col. 112, lines 59-67).

Double Patenting

7. Claims 1-14 and 16-28 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 22-36 of copending Application No. 09/876,374.

An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claims. See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 22 of the 09/876,374 is a species of claims 1 and 18 of the current application, therefore claims 1 and 18 are anticipated by claim 22 of the 09/876,374 application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. No references were found teaching or suggesting claims 1-14, 16, 17 and 24-27, but they are rejected for reasons given above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Teresa E Strzelecka whose telephone number is (703) 306-5877. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached at (703) 308-1119. The fax phone numbers for the organization

Art Unit: 1637

where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

March 4, 2003

Teresa Strzelecka, Ph. D.

Patent Examiner

Teresa Strzelecka

3/4/03